# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

VS. CRIMINAL NO. 1:17CR90

MARIA TERESA DUARTE GODINEZ, ALFONSO FONTY JAIMES

### TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE LOUIS GUIROLA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DECEMBER 20, 2018 GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI

#### **APPEARANCES:**

FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
SHUNDRAL COLE, ESQUIRE
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
1575 20TH AVENUE
GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI 39501

FOR THE DEFENDANT, MARIA TERESA DUARTE GODINEZ:
ROBERT K. PISARICH, ESQUIRE
KEITH PISARICH, ATTORNEY
POST OFFICE BOX 936
BILOXI, MISSISSIPPI 39533-0936

FOR THE DEFENDANT, ALFONSO FONTY JAIMES: ELLEN MAIER ALLRED, ESQUIRE OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER 2510 14TH STREET, SUITE 902 GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI 39501

INTERPRETER: BALBINA CALDWELL

REPORTED BY: TERI B. NORTON, RMR, FCRR, RDR 2012 15TH STREET, SUITE 403 GULFPORT, MISSISSIPPI 39501

(228)563-1748

Madam clerk, you may call the case. 1 THE COURT: 2 THE CLERK: The United States District Court for the 3 Southern District of Mississippi, Southern Division, Criminal 4 Case Number 1:17cr90, United States of America versus Alfonso 5 Fonty Jaimes and Maria Teresa Duarte Godinez, set for 6 sentencing. 7 What says the government? THE COURT: 8 Good morning, Your Honor. Shundral Cole MS. COLE: 9 for the government, and we are ready. 10 **THE COURT:** What says the defendant, Jaimes? 11 MS. ALLRED: We are ready to proceed, Your Honor. 12. **THE COURT:** What says the defendant, Godinez? 13 MR. PISARICH: Yes, Your Honor. Keith Pisarich 14 present for the defendant, Maria Teresa Duarte Godinez. Also 15 present in the courtroom, of course, is my client, along with 16 the court's interpreter, Ms. Caldwell. We are ready to 17 proceed. 18 THE COURT: Very well. Let the record reflect that 19 the Court has decided to conduct the sentencing hearing in this 20 matter as to both defendants at the same time. The issues are 2.1 the same, the objections raised in the presentence 22 investigation report are identical, and they are both charged 23 in the same indictment. Does the government have any objection 24 to taking up both of these sentencing hearings at the same

25

time?

1 MS. COLE: No, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Does the defendant Jaimes have any 3 objection? 4 MS. ALLRED: We don't, Your Honor. 5 **THE COURT:** Does the defendant Godinez have any 6 objection? 7 MR. PISARICH: No, Your Honor, we don't, but I do 8 have an announcement to the Court. As stated in our objections 9 to the presentence investigation report, we have made an 10 objection as far as mitigating role, a minor participant. 11 the Court would allow us, we would like to withdraw that 12 objection, as well as we would like to make sure the Court is 13 specifically aware that we did make an objection with regard to 14 possession of the gun, and the gun that we're referring to in 15 that particular matter, I wasn't as specific as I should have 16 been, was the nine-millimeter gun that was found on Ms. 17 Snodgrass' possession when she was arrested. That's the gun 18 that we were referring to. I had put qun. 19 THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's -- that's my 20 understanding as well, which is the same objection made by Mr. 21 Jaimes. 22 It is, Your Honor. And after filing the MS. ALLRED:

MS. ALLRED: It is, Your Honor. And after filing the objection, Ms. Snodgrass made it to the district. And when I interviewed her, she gave me facts that I think are those that we're not able to overcome. If she were called to the stand,

23

24

which I think she will be, and we can get into it then, I think she is going to testify essentially that she told the defendants that she had a gun with her. So we would stipulate to those facts, that maybe there was knowledge that they had the gun. And it just becomes a legal question at that as to whether I guess the other facts that Ms. Snodgrass will testify to, such as the fact that she had had the gun long before she went on these trips, I think — what I'm saying to the Court is, that is the extent of my objection, whether under the facts that I think are going to be elucidated when she testifies, whether it is appropriate to hold all of them responsible for the gun.

2.1

THE COURT: Fair enough. We will take those matters up one at a time.

MR. PISARICH: I think, Your Honor, I likewise interviewed Ms. Snodgrass, and I think that's pretty well the same understanding I had after interviewing her, as far as what she would say referencing the gun, the nine-millimeter.

THE COURT: What you are telling me is that it may not be a factual dispute but instead a question of application of that particular guideline to those facts?

MS. ALLRED: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. PISARICH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me take up a couple of housekeeping matters first. Insofar as Ms. Godinez is concerned, it is my

understanding, Mr. Pisarich, that she is in the need of a court interpreter. And to that end, we have Ms. Balbina Caldwell here. Is that accurate?

MR. PISARICH: I missed the first part.

12.

**THE COURT:** Your client needs the services of an interpreter, is my understanding.

MR. PISARICH: She feels much better, Your Honor, with the services of an interpreter. She does speak some English. I have been able to communicate back and forth with her to a certain degree, but as far as the sentencing, I think it would be out of an abundance of caution for the Court to use the services of an interpreter.

THE COURT: Well, to that end, of course, we have asked Ms. Caldwell to join us. Unfortunately, Ms. Caldwell is not a certified court interpreter. However, in my judgment, she is an exceptionally gifted interpreter and has demonstrated that ability many times. Does Ms. Godinez have any objections to the use of Ms. Caldwell as the interpreter here?

MR. PISARICH: She has just been asked that question by the interpreter, and she has responded no. We have used Ms. Caldwell in the past, I think at the plea, and everything went well then.

THE COURT: Very well. Without objection then, the Court does find that a certified court interpreter is not reasonably available at this time. However, Ms. Caldwell has

demonstrated her -- I think I referred to it as a gift, but her skill as serving as an interpreter and will do so here today.

Would the clerk of the court please swear in the court interpreter.

(OATH ADMINISTERED TO INTERPRETER).

THE COURT: All right. Well, let the record reflect, before we get too very much along, that I did conduct a very brief in-chambers conference with counsel for the government, counsel for both defendants, and the probation office was present as well. At that particular time, I was advised by Ms. Allred that she intended to call one of the confidential informants, Ms. Snodgrass, to the stand to produce some testimony which may be in conflict with some of the materials that she provided or some of the information that she provided to the case agent and which ultimately found its way into the presentence investigation report. So I ask you, Ms. Cole, is the agent who interviewed Ms. Snodgrass available today?

MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor, he is present in the

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Let's take this matter up then. First of all, we will deal with the guidelines. Ms. Cole, on behalf of the government, did you receive the presentence investigation report?

MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And did you have an opportunity to go

2.1

courtroom.

1 over it? 2 I did, Your Honor. MS. COLE: 3 THE COURT: Does the government have any objections 4 either to the findings of fact or the application of the 5 guidelines in either of the reports dealing with Mr. Jaimes or 6 with Ms. Godinez? 7 MS. COLE: No, sir, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Very well. Ms. Allred, on behalf of Mr. 9 Jaimes, did you have an opportunity to observe and to read and to go over the presentence investigation report with him? 10 11 MS. ALLRED: I did, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: In your judgment, did he understand the 13 findings of fact and the application of the guidelines 14 contained in the report? MS. ALLRED: He did, Your Honor. He's been very 15 16 helpful in helping me develop evidence maybe that is not 17 consistent with the presentence report. 18 THE COURT: All right. I'm aware that you've made 19 two objections --20 MS. ALLRED: That's correct. 2.1 **THE COURT:** -- to the presentence investigation 22 Those are in writing. But would you encapsulate those 23 two objections for the record so that we can frame the issues? 24 Yes, sir. Keep in mind, Your Honor, MS. ALLRED: 25

that when I filed these objections, it was before I had had an

opportunity to interview Ms. Snodgrass personally.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. ALLRED: But the gist of the first objection is that Mr. Jaimes qualifies for a minor role, that he played a significantly — I guess a significantly less role than the other players in this drug trafficking conspiracy.

And then the other objection has to do with the firearm. And again, it was prior to the time that I had an opportunity to interview Ms. Snodgrass.

And therefore, I think that we are clear on what the facts are going to show. I think the facts are going to show that Ms. Snodgrass will testify that she always carried a gun with her, that she purchased the gun several years before she began carrying it, that she advised both Mr. Jaimes and Ms. Godinez, I guess in passing, that she carried a gun. So the question becomes really was that gun there to facilitate this drug transaction and was — or is it also attributable to Mr. Jaimes. So those are the two objections.

And before I cede the floor, it is my understanding that although the government says they don't object to the facts in the presentence report, that they neither — that they agree that a minor role as participant for Mr. Jaimes is appropriate in this case. And of course, recognizing the fact that the Court isn't bound by that, and to the extent — I think it is a good idea to put Ms. Snodgrass on the stand because if the

Court were to simply go with what the parties think is appropriate without putting on any testimony, we would be left with a presentence report that has facts that are inconsistent with both the parties' agreement, as well as a ruling.

12.

THE COURT: All right. I think your points are well taken, Ms. Allred. The fact that you have called Ms. Snodgrass and we are going to hear from her under oath is very helpful to the Court, because there are inconsistencies in what she has said, and it is important to try to nail down how that happens and how the probation officers are literally left holding the bag with information contained in DEA-6s and FBI 302s that are later inconsistent with what the informants say.

You know, having had some experience in not only being a judge, but as a prosecutor and as a law enforcement officer, I understand how that can occur, but we need to pin it down, and we need to find out how and under what circumstances that occurred.

MS. ALLRED: Your Honor, if I may, I guess sort of as an opening statement, I think that when a person is interviewed can play a part in how a report is crafted. When Ms. Snodgrass was interviewed, this case was very small and very focused, and this is what was known. And as the facts began to develop and the sphere begins to spread, I think it is less the fact that reports are wrong. It's just that they don't necessarily describe the big picture.

1 Well, we will hear what Ms. Snodgrass has THE COURT: 2 to say, and both sides will have a full opportunity to require 3 her to, shall we say, experience the crucible of both direct 4 and cross-examination. 5 MS. ALLRED: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Pisarich, on behalf of 7 your client, Ms. Godinez, did you also have an opportunity to 8 go over the presentence investigation report with her? 9 MR. PISARICH: I did, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Did you find it necessary to use an 11 interpreter for that? 12. MR. PISARICH: I did, Your Honor, use an interpreter, 13 at least on I think one or two occasions, and talked back with 14 her on maybe one or two more. 15 THE COURT: In your judgment, did she understand the 16 presentence investigation report and the application of the 17 quidelines as contained in the report? 18 MR. PISARICH: She did, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. And I understand that even 20 though you made two objections that were in writing, and you 2.1 intend to withdraw one, why don't you go ahead and state into 22 the record what those objections are and those that are withdrawn so that we can frame the issues. 23 24 MR. PISARICH: Right. Your Honor, I think one thing

we don't need to get into right now, even though I made a

reference to it in my — from paragraph 22 of the report, in my paragraph 22, is my client's either knowledge or lack of knowledge of this heroin or black heroin that was found with Ms. Snodgrass. That's not going to affect the computation, so we will withdraw that, if the Court please. The computations, even without it, go to the max.

THE COURT: Have you discussed that with your client?

MR. PISARICH: Yes, Your Honor.

12.

2.1

**THE COURT:** Is she in agreement with that?

MR. PISARICH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that correct, Ms. Godinez, that you are in agreement to withdraw that objection?

**DEFENDANT GODINEZ:** Yes.

MR. PISARICH: The issue is, Your Honor, we are withdrawing the objection. We are not basically admitting that she had because there is no sense in prolonging the hearing if the outcome either way is the same result insofar as the base offense level. That's my point.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PISARICH: Again, Your Honor, on paragraph 77, as far as the offense level computation, we object to the nine-millimeter gun that was found in Ms. Snodgrass' possession being attributable to my client, if the Court please. Again, in paragraph 78, that's the one where we made an objection insofar as role in the offense. We have, as previously stated

1 to the Court this morning, withdrawn that objection, if the 2 Court please. 3 And that's --4 THE COURT: I presume that you have discussed that 5 also with your client and withdrawn that objection as to the 6 role adjustment? 7 I did. As soon as we came out of that MR. PISARICH: 8 conference with the interpreter, I discussed that with my 9 client, and she agrees to do what I'm announcing to the Court, withdraw that objection with the Court. 10 11 **THE COURT:** Is that correct, Ms. Godinez? 12. DEFENDANT GODINEZ: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Very well. That objection is withdrawn. 14 All right. I think it best, for the purposes of the two 15 objections that remain on behalf of Mr. Jaimes and the one 16 objection that remains on behalf of Ms. Godinez, is that we go 17 ahead and take up the testimony of Ms. Snodgrass and get that 18 behind us. Would that process be acceptable to the government? 19 MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Ms. Allred, would that be acceptable to 2.1 your client? 22 It would, Your Honor. And I would MS. ALLRED: 23 request, since I brought Ms. Snodgrass to the district to call 24 as a witness on Mr. Jaimes' behalf, that I do direct. 25 THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Pisarich, is that

1 process all right with you? 2 MR. PISARICH: That's fine with me, Your Honor, as 3 long as I have the potential to ask some questions, if 4 necessary. 5 **THE COURT:** But of course. Is Ms. Snodgrass 6 represented by counsel? 7 MS. ALLRED: She was represented in the underlying 8 case by Doyle Coats, and prior to my reaching out to Ms. 9 Snodgrass -- initially, I reached out by phone to see if I 10 could speak to her without actually bringing her to the 11 district, but she -- she, I think, wisely declined to speak to 12. me without first speaking to the government. Mr. Coats said he 13 no longer represented her, so when I brought her here, I interviewed her myself. I think she has also been in contact 14 15 with, not directly, the government, but has also met with the 16 agent who conducted the initial interview at least once -- one 17 time? 18 I met with her twice. 19 MS. ALLRED: Twice since she has been here. 20 THE COURT: All right. More directly, is she 2.1 represented today by counsel? 22 MS. ALLRED: No, she's not, and nor do I anticipate 23 that she is going to be asked any questions that would tend to 24 incriminate her. 25 THE COURT: That's my concern here, that --

1 I guess neither party, I think, and MS. ALLRED: 2 correct me if I am wrong, but neither the agents, the FBI, or I 3 think that once she testifies that she will have made any false 4 I think we are all in agreement on what she has statements. 5 told them and what she has told me. 6 **THE COURT:** Let me ask you this hypothetical 7 question. I don't know what Ms. Snodgrass is going to say 8 under oath. 9 MS. ALLRED: Sure. 10 THE COURT: I only have the representation that 11 you've made, Ms. Allred as an officer of the Court, that there 12 will be inconsistencies in what she has said to you and what 13 she has said to an investigator, I presume a DEA -- Ms. Cole, a 14 DEA agent? 15 MS. COLE: FBI, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: An FBI agent. That could very well 17 expose her to a new or a different prosecution for making a 18 false statement to that FBI agent. Under those circumstances, 19 are we treading in dangerous waters here by requiring Ms. 20 Snodgrass under oath to tell us that she told the FBI agents 2.1 something that wasn't true? 22 MS. ALLRED: I don't think she did. 23 **THE COURT:** Speaking hypothetically. 24 MS. ALLRED: Hypothetically, I don't think she did.

I think that -- I'll give an example. Like the initial reports

would say things like she worked for Teré and her husband. And Teré's husband was there. Okay. But what exactly it was that he was doing — the devil is going to be in the details. I can't speak for FBI and the government, but I don't think that anybody thinks that she has at any time lied to the FBI or that her statements that she is going to make today are inconsistent with anything she has ever said from the get—go.

THE COURT: I'm just looking at the presentence investigation report, starting with paragraph 28. "When questioned further about the involvement of Godinez and her husband, she claimed that Godinez handled the business part. Snodgrass knew that she personally knew Godinez would wire funds to Mexico. Snodgrass further stated that she turned her receipts for travel in to Godinez, who reimbursed her."

The next paragraph deals with Mr. Jaimes. "Snodgrass stated that Alfonso Jaimes was more operationally involved in the drug transaction organization, the DTO, and often paid her for her services as a courier in cash or drugs for payment. She stated that she bought an ounce of methamphetamine at a time from Jaimes because she could purchase it for \$400, and would make this purchase once a month. When she was paid in cash, Snodgrass would often use the money to fund prepaid MasterCard and American Express and did not deposit the money."

In paragraph 30, "Snodgrass advised that Godinez and Jaimes lived in south Austin, Texas, and she had gone to their

apartment on prior occasions to get paid and turn in receipts.

Agents confirm that the registered address of Godinez and

Jaimes was an apartment at the complex."

Finally, in paragraph 31, "Snodgrass claimed that Godinez and/or Jaimes arranged all of the drug shipments. When either of them needed a load of narcotics shipped, they would contact" — the problem is — quoting from the report, it says, "They."

MS. ALLRED: I know.

THE COURT: "They would contact her and arrange a time for Godinez's cousin to drop off a load. Snodgrass claimed that Godinez's cousin typically brought the drug shipments to her."

MS. ALLRED: And I guess, Your Honor, what I — it does — it appears from the reports, in hindsight, that Mr. Jaimes is lumped in with a lot of conduct that involves his wife. He is not innocent. He did participate. But when you go back in hindsight and look at what he did and the whole — I guess the whole scope of it, I think it becomes clear that he is a lesser player.

And I see where you are going. I mean, out of an abundance of caution, it could not hurt. I hate to -- I hate to keep Ms. Snodgrass here any longer than is necessary. I mean, one thought that I have is to do a proffer of what her testimony would be and perhaps discuss it with the government

and the probation office to see if the facts can be tweaked in the presentence report without actually calling her. I'm just trying to come up with a solution.

I mean, I have the report of the statements that she gave to me, that she was allowed to review and change. I also gave it to the agent in this case, who was able to review it. So I really feel like, to a certain extent, we are on the same page, just that we haven't necessarily brought anyone else into that page with us. So —

THE COURT: Ms. Cole, what is the government's position on this? It's -- well, I will point out what should be obvious. The government -- it's the government's job not just to obtain convictions but to be sure that justice is being done, and I want to be sure that everyone in this courtroom, including the witness, Ms. Snodgrass, is afforded every opportunity that due process and justice requires.

Now, there are some inconsistencies here that may simply be semantic inconsistencies. I'm fine with that. It can happen. But what's the government's position?

MS. COLE: Your Honor, the government's position is,

I believe what -- more specifically, what Ms. Allred is
speaking to is that clarification is needed as far as what the
roles of each of these defendants in this case -- what their
roles were, according to Ms. Snodgrass. I don't want to say on
the record that the government would not pursue potential

charges against Ms. Snodgrass if something she says on the stand is inconsistent. I don't believe that — or that she will get on the stand and perjure herself or lie, as far as what she told to the FBI agent when she was interviewed after she was arrested.

I think the interview that Ms. Allred has conducted with her, along with the case agent, who has seen her twice since she has been back in the district, I think her statements are consistent with what she has already — the information she has already provided. I just think that there is some clarification that is needed from Ms. Snodgrass as to the roles of each of these defendants.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. ALLRED: And again, Your Honor, one possible selection, but I don't know that it's the best solution, and that would be for the government and I and the probation office to sit down with the report of the statements that were made by Ms. Snodgrass and notate where they differ from what is included in the presentence report, so that as it related to Mr. Snodgrass — I'm sorry, as it related to Mr. Jaimes was correct based on what the parties can agree that Ms. Snodgrass would say. To the extent that we all can't agree, she is here. And it may narrow down — narrow down those issues.

I mean, to be clear, she is here, and she's a good witness, and she knows what happened, and we can put her on the

stand and it will go forward, or those facts will also work if probation needed to ask her questions to clarify things that we couldn't all agree on. But I think that there are true consistencies — inconsistencies between the verbiage, the way that Mr. Jaimes tends to be lumped into some conduct that he didn't participate in, that were carried through all the way into the presentence report, that if you read that presentence report and take it faithfully do not support a minor role, but I think that the facts in the case do. And we have nothing to hide about that.

THE COURT: Let me do this. I don't think Ms. Cole objects to the prosecution meeting with counsel for the defendant --

MS. COLE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- and seeing if there are some stipulations as to the facts or proffers of the testimony. I can't be a part of either team. I'm concerned about Ms. Snodgrass' constitutional rights at this point.

MS. ALLRED: Sure.

2.1

THE COURT: And I have to leave it to the government and have some confidence in the government that if there's an intentional misrepresentation of facts whether or not they intend to proceed with criminal charges. That's not up to me. That's up to the executive branch. But I don't want to be a part of putting Ms. Snodgrass in a position where she does

exactly that, makes the government's case on either a thousand and one for lying to an FBI agent or perjured testimony from the stand. So if the parties can — I guess what I'm getting down to, Ms. Cole, I have to rely on the integrity of the executive branch to review what facts are available to determine are there simply semantical differences in what has been provided and what is available in the report, or are there intentional falsehoods on the part of Ms. Snodgrass that need to be followed through. And that matter, that investigation, that conclusion should be left to the prosecution and not to me.

2.1

What I will say, and I will put this in as a footnote is that when the Court gets ready to proceed in a sentencing hearing, it relies on the report made by the probation office and the presentence investigation report, and the probation officers rely on what is in the reports of investigation. And when there are material differences, that puts everybody in a very difficult spot, particularly the probation officers.

Let's take a recess, then, and Ms. Allred, I invite you and Mr. Pisarich and counsel for the government, as well as the investigating officer, to — and I think Ms. Allred, you've even included the probation officers.

MS. ALLRED: If you think that that is acceptable.

THE COURT: I don't think there is anything that would prevent it. And see what it is you can work out in the

form of stipulated facts or --

12.

2.1

MS. ALLRED: Your Honor, I still have one worry that -- how do we clean up the PSI? Is it sufficient to come up with stipulations, or do we need to go through line by line and clarify where there are things that we think need to change? Because there needs to be -- it's often a problem for defense counsel when there are findings by the Court that aren't necessarily consistent with the PSI, and we go back after the fact and really all we have is this PSI. I guess I'm asking are stipulations sufficient, or do we need to --

THE COURT: Stipulations of fact, where there are differences in the PSI, is what the Court will consider, obviously.

MS. ALLRED: Okay.

THE COURT: And when those facts are stipulated, I will take those facts and digest them and analyze them and apply them to the guideline and determine is Mr. Jaimes a minor — entitled to a minor role adjustment or not, by a preponderance of the evidence.

And parenthetically, we need to discuss the issue related to the firearm as well because that's an application of the guidelines as opposed to — it doesn't seem to be a dispute about the fact that Ms. Snodgrass had a pistol at the time that she was arrested and that — I think what you are telling me is that both defendants knew that she had a pistol.

MS. ALLRED: Well, if Snodgrass was going to testify, 1 2 that is what she would testify to. 3 THE COURT: I will take a recess, and y'all let me 4 know when you are ready. 5 (RECESS TAKEN AT 10:46 A.M. UNTIL 1:10 P.M.) Is the government ready to proceed? 6 THE COURT: 7 MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor. 8 Are the defendants ready to proceed? THE COURT: 9 MS. ALLRED: Defendant Jaimes is ready to proceed. 10 MR. PISARICH: Defendant Godinez is ready to proceed, 11 Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: All right. Then I turn, Ms. Allred, to 13 you because the only objection here which requires some additional facts is the objection that your client has made in 14 15 regard to the -- his minimal participation. Do you intend to call any witnesses? 16 17 MS. ALLRED: Your Honor, in an effort to avoid having 18 to call Ms. Snodgrass to the stand, I sat down and met with the 19 probation officer, the prosecutor and co-counsel in an attempt 20 to reach a series of stipulations. We maintain the position 2.1 that compared to others involved in this offense that Mr. 22 Jaimes was a minor participant, and that the original reports, 23 while they made their best effort to get things accurate, don't 24 give the flavor for his participation, that what he did, he did

at the behest of his wife and that his role was relatively

minor.

2.1

So we have attempted to clarify where we think that the presentence report is not accurate in that it tends to lump Mr. Jaimes in with all of his wife's conduct.

We've attempted to do this to avoid calling Ms. Snodgrass to the stand. I am still perfectly willing, if the Court feels that it needs additional information, to put her on the stand and fill in any of the blanks that there are concerning this conduct. I feel like I don't necessarily need to, that the facts are sufficient to establish a minor role, and it is my understanding that the government agrees that this defendant should get a minor role. And we've tried to resolve this in a way that did not involve jeopardizing Ms. Snodgrass. It's a bit of a difficult position to no end because I don't know whether I need to call any further witnesses.

THE COURT: It's up to you.

MS. ALLRED: On advice of co-counsel, he suggested that we enter these stipulations into evidence in lieu of the testimony. Certainly Ms. Snodgrass is available, and should the Court feel that there are gaps in the evidence that you need to have in order to make an informed decision, we are available to call her. However, we will rest on these stipulations.

THE COURT: Any objection -- are these your stipulations as well, Ms. Cole, on behalf of the government?

MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor. As Ms. Allred stated, we all met with Ms. Snodgrass and went over, asked her specific questions. Ms. Allred transcribed the information that Ms. Snodgrass provided, and we asked her to clarify anything that we needed, and we made sure that what was placed into these stipulations were accurate, and we all agreed they were accurate. So the government does agree with the stipulations.

THE COURT: All right. It will be marked and admitted as Defense Exhibit Number 1 to this sentencing hearing. Please provide it to the clerk.

# (EXHIBIT D-1 MARKED)

2.1

**THE COURT:** All right. Anything else on behalf of the defendant, Mr. Jaimes?

MS. ALLRED: Not in terms of evidence, unless the Court would like more information about the total organization. Again, I'm attempting to abbreviate and minimize exposure for Ms. Snodgrass. We could probably talk about things that went on all day long, but what we are attempting to demonstrate is that when you consider the participants in this, Mr. Jaimes was on the low end of the totem pole.

THE COURT: This stipulation that the government and the defendant have entered into would tell me what Mr. Jaimes' participation is insofar as Ms. Snodgrass is concerned, but it gives me no information whatsoever as to what Mr. Jaimes' participation was in the overall conspiracy and what makes him

substantially less culpable than any other member. This just tells me what he did with her. I have no idea what he did with others, and there's no evidence in that regard. Do you intend to offer any evidence in that regard?

MS. ALLRED: I guess, Your Honor, the evidence in this case came from Ms. Snodgrass to a large extent. His role in the offense was set by the statements that Ms. Snodgrass provided in her proffer. So I'm attempting, in establishing what his role in the offense is, to -- I guess to --

THE COURT: Let me help you with that. You're trying to encapsulate what Mr. Jaimes' role is based on what he did with Ms. Snodgrass. This is a conspiracy case, which involves a lot of other players, and the burden is upon the defendant to demonstrate to me by a preponderance of the evidence, and there must be some evidence that tends to indicate that his participation in that overall conspiracy is less culpable, substantially less culpable than the ordinary participant.

Now, Ms. Snodgrass was able to tell me what he did insofar as she is concerned, but there is no evidence before the Court at this time as to what he did insofar as any of the other participants are concerned. And I can't sit here and just guess at it. As a matter of fact, if I were asked to guess, it would not go well for the defendant.

MS. ALLRED: Understood. I would call Agent Jason

Dufault to the stand.

1 **THE COURT:** You may proceed. 2 JASON DUFAULT, 3 having first been duly sworn, testified as follows: 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. ALLRED: 6 Thank you, sir. Would you state your name, please, for 7 the record? 8 Jason Dufault. Α. 9 And how are you employed, sir? 10 Α. I'm employed as a Special Agent with the FBI. 11 Ο. How long have you been with the FBI? 12. Approximately three years. Α. 13 And you are the lead case agent in this case; is that 14 correct? 15 That is correct. Α. 16 Would you state, please, how your office and you 17 particularly were alerted to how this case began? 18 It originally started in December of 2016. We had a 19 six-kilo seizure of methamphetamine on I-10, and Tiffany 20 Snodgrass was arrested. From there, through cell phone 21 extractions and through several statements by Ms. Snodgrass, we 22 identified Alfonso Jaimes and Maria Teresa Duarte as Tiffany's 23 facilitators. 24 Q. Okay. Now, we are going to go back to that in a moment, 25 but did your investigation lead you to conclude that prior to

- 1 her trip to Mississippi, that Ms. Snodgrass was working for
- 2 some other people involved in drug trafficking?
- 3 A. That is correct, yes.
- 4 Q. And who are those people?
- 5 A. So it's a familial connection to Ms. Duarte. It is Jacob
- 6 Duarte and Antonio Duarte Godinez were her original points of
- 7 contact for this drug trafficking organization.
- 8 Q. So would it be fair in saying that when Ms. Snodgrass
- 9 began, she was working for two men named Otoniel and Jacob? Is
- 10 that right?
- 11 A. Correct. Jacob and Tony is what she knew them as.
- 12 Q. And these two defendants are related to Ms. Godinez; is
- 13 | that right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. At some point, Ms. Snodgrass began working or dealing with
- 16 someone else; is that right?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. And who was that?
- 19 A. So after a period of about six to eight months, Ms.
- 20 | Snodgrass was introduced to Ms. Duarte through her brothers.
- 21 Q. Okay. And why did that shift take place?
- 22 A. In Ms. Snodgrass' own words, she stated the two brothers
- 23 weren't looking out for her best interest. They were -- she
- 24 quoted saying that she felt like a sitting duck. Sometimes she
- 25 would make a drug shipment and be waiting in a parking lot for

- an extended period of time, and things were not running as
- 2 smoothly as she would have liked.
- Q. Okay. So she began dealing with Ms. Godinez; is that
- 5 A. Yes.

correct?

- Q. Now, how did Godinez and Ms. Snodgrass communicate?
- A. Primarily through within her phone, she had three contacts. One was Teré, the other was Teré2, and the third
- 9 contact was Teré husband.
- 10 Q. Okay. So let's talk about that. You obtained phone
- 11 records for both Ms. Snodgrass and Ms. Godinez and Mr. Jaimes;
- 12 is that right?
- 13 A. I believe so, yes.
- 14 Q. And without nailing you down too specifically, can you --
- approximately how much -- how many contacts were there between
- Ms. Snodgrass and Ms. Godinez's phone?
- 17 A. So it was for just a pretty short duration. I don't know
- 18 if -- it was never brought up if Tiffany deleted the contacts
- on her phone or whatever the case may be, but there were
- 20 several communications between Snodgrass and Ms. Duarte.
- 21 Q. Is it fair to say there were hundreds? I don't want to
- 22 put words in your mouth.
- A. Certainly from the toll records, but we did a cell phone
- 24 dump of both of Tiffany's phones, and there were not hundreds
- of messages between them, but there were several text chains

- 1 that referenced drug-related activities.
- 2 Q. Okay. And these messages tend to indicate it was Ms.
- 3 Godinez and not Mr. Jaimes that was arranging for shipments and
- 4 | facilitating these shipments; is that right?
- 5 A. That would be correct, yes.
- 6 Q. Okay. Now, in fairness, there were some communications
- 7 between Ms. Snodgrass and Mr. Jaimes; is that right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. Now, is it also fair to say that in clarifying the
- 10 reasons for those calls, that Ms. Snodgrass advised that she
- 11 only called Mr. Jaimes when she needed to get in touch with Ms.
- 12 Godinez. Is that fair?
- 13 A. That is a fair assessment. She did also state that when
- 14 she needed to obtain personal stashes of meth, that she would
- 15 contact Mr. Jaimes direct.
- 16 Q. All right. And Ms. Snodgrass was a methamphetamine user;
- 17 is that right?
- 18 A. She was.
- 19 Q. And do you know if Mr. Jaimes also used methamphetamine?
- 20 A. I was not generally aware of his drug habits.
- 21 Q. Okay. Now, did Ms. Snodgrass also advise you of other
- 22 people that were involved in -- in the organization in Texas?
- 23 A. She did.
- 24 Q. Can you provide an overall, I quess, description of the
- 25 organization, perhaps starting here and moving out?

- 1 A. Okay. So we have Ms. Snodgrass, who's the courier that we
- 2 | identified. Taking that one level further to her facilitators,
- 3 we identified the two codefendants, along with Jacob Duarte and
- 4 Antonio Duarte Godinez. From there, it kind of branched out.
- We did a phone dump on Ms. Duarte's cell phone post arrest and
- 6 identified her Mexican source of supply that she was
- 7 | communicating with. And through some proffers with them, they
- 8 | identified her source of supply.
- 9 Additionally, there are 43 other subjects related to this
- 10 DTO that were federally indicted out of the Western District of
- 11 Texas, so there's a substantial amount of crossover with our
- 12 three subjects here in Mississippi and with the Western
- 13 District of Texas.
- 14 Q. Okay. And if I can, let me follow up on a couple of
- 15 things that you stated. You stated that based on looking at
- 16 the phone records, and specifically Ms. Godinez's phone, you
- were able to identify the source of supply; is that right?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. And there were contacts between Godinez's phone and the
- 20 source of supply; is that right?
- 21 **A.** Yes.
- 22 Q. Are you aware or do you have evidence of any contacts on
- 23 the part of Mr. Jaimes and any Mexican source of supply?
- 24 A. Other than him being referenced by name in numerous
- 25 conversations with the source of supply and Duarte, I have no

- evidence that he directly contacted the Mexican source of supply.
- 3 Q. Okay. Well, let's follow up on that.
- 4 A. Okay.
- Q. There were -- is it fair to say that there were messages
- 6 on Ms. Godinez's phone with a third party where they asked Mr.
- 7 Jaimes to transport money and/or drugs?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Did those messages also indicate that Mr. Jaimes, for various reasons, wasn't going to do that or did not want to do
- 11 that or would not do that?
- 12 A. The one particular example that I read to you, he declined
- 13 to take that shipment. There are other text messages where it
- appears more so related to the money shipment that he did make
- 15 trips.
- 16 Q. Okay. And to be fair, when you met with Mr. Jaimes --
- 17 **THE COURT:** Wait just a minute, because I'm becoming
- 18 confused. When you say money shipments, he made trips, are you
- 19 referring to Mr. Jaimes made trips to deliver money shipments?
- 20 A. Yes, Your Honor.
- 21 **THE COURT:** To whom?
- 22 **THE WITNESS:** They were to recipients that were
- directed by the Mexican source of supply.
- 24 **THE COURT:** But not exclusively to Ms. Snodgrass?
- 25 **THE WITNESS:** Correct. The review period where I'm

1 looking at this activity was a year after Ms. Snodgrass had 2 already been arrested. This is from 2017. 3 THE COURT: So the conduct that Mr. Jaimes engaged in 4 in delivering monies to Ms. Snodgrass, he also did that with 5 other drug couriers. Would that be accurate? 6 MS. ALLRED: Well --7 THE COURT: Wait just a minute now. Would that be 8 accurate? 9 THE WITNESS: There is some information in the text 10 messages that suggests that he was paying a truck driver 11 courier a percentage to make deliveries, based off of the text 12 conversations. 13 **THE COURT:** And this is the defendant, Mr. Jaimes? 14 THE WITNESS: Mr. Jaimes is in concert with Ms. 15 Duarte. At times it's very difficult to separate which one was 16 involved in what activity because he primarily drove for her, 17 and his English was much better. So he, a lot of times, acted 18 as a translator on her behalf, so it's very difficult for me to 19 accurately assess separate roles, in a sense, because they are 20 together.

THE COURT: Fair enough. Go ahead.

## BY MS. ALLRED:

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And to follow up on those questions, when you take a step back looking at relative roles, would you have described Mr. Jaimes as being on equal footing with his wife, or with the

brothers, or would you have described him as a different sort of role?

- A. Right. I believe that Ms. Duarte, by all accounts, she did the bookkeeping for the U.S. segment of this drug trafficking organization. He did not work in that capacity. His roles were much more of kind of a worker bee. He would do things with Ms. Duarte, but he, I don't believe, had the level of responsibility where he was accounting for money and drug amounts or logistics or anything like that.
  - Q. Okay. And that leads me to another question of what you testified to. You know, you said that Ms. Snodgrass I guess you lumped Ms. Jaimes in as a Mr. Jaimes in as a facilitator with his wife, but the facilitating was actually done by whom in this case?
  - A. I guess it depends on what the definition of facilitating is.
  - Q. Who made arrangements for pickups?
  - A. So Maria would organize -- from my understanding, she would call Tiffany and say, we need -- you know, this is just an example -- we need six kilos shipped to Atlanta, and it would be Maria that would handle the logistics segment of that.

Now, as far as whoever met up with Tiffany to pay her for her services after she made the trip, both of them would be together. So if he is a facilitator in that sense, he is paying her for her shipment, but he's not doing the main

- administrative logistics that is required with these drug shipments.
  - Q. Okay. Did he have any sort of ownership interest in the shipments?
    - A. In the sense was he profiting from that activity?
  - Q. They weren't his drugs, were they?
    - A. They were not his drugs. They were not his drugs.
- Q. Did he have any decision-making authority or discretion concerning how these -- I guess how the organization operated?
- 10 A. Not in my investigation, I did not determine that.
  - Q. Okay. Were there statements made by Ms. Snodgrass based on her observation of how everything worked and went down that the others sort of didn't want to give Mr. Jaimes a very important role, based on his drinking?
    - A. Right. She had made the comment that he wanted a higher role in the organization, but they would not allow for it, and that he was really a nobody, in her words, as far as this drug trafficking organization was concerned.
    - Q. Okay. And that's what Ms. Snodgrass said. She referred to him in the context of this organization to be nobody. Is that --
- 22 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

11

12.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Now, you testified that — let me ask you, if I can, to sort of help create a big picture of hierarchy, if I can. If you were to pinpoint who would be sort of at the top

- 1 of this organization in terms of responsibility for the drugs
- 2 or top of the food chain, if you will, just for lack of a
- 3 better word, who would you put at the top from who you know
- 4 that was involved?
- 5 A. Based on who I know, it's the Mexican source of supply
- 6 that was communicating with Ms. Duarte, and he was identified
- 7 as Alejandro Viagas.
- 8 Q. Okay. And underneath him, to the extent of your
- 9 investigation, it would have involved who?
- 10 A. He was communicating to Maria, who in turn would -- in my
- 11 investigative opinion, I believe that her two brothers and her
- were essentially on the same footing.
- 13 Q. Okay. But then there were also others involved as well.
- 14 There were certain cousins, were there not, of the Duarte
- 15 Godinezes?
- 16 A. Right.
- 17 Q. And who were those people?
- 18 A. So there was Guillermo Juarez and Alejandro Mesa Palisios.
- 19 They were two relatives. I'm not sure if Guillermo actually
- 20 was a relative of hers, but they were the cooks in a sense.
- 21 They transferred the methamphetamine from liquid to crystal
- 22 form in a clandestine lab in Cedar Creek, Texas. So there were
- 23 numerous players involved in the Austin area in this DTO. I
- 24 mean, like I said, 43 people were federally indicted out of
- 25 Texas. So in the grand scheme of this conspiracy, I would

- 1 characterize Mr. Jaimes' role as a relatively low player in the
- grand scheme of the conspiracy.
- Q. Okay. And in fact, there were times, were there not, when
- 4 Ms. Godinez and Mr. Jaimes weren't together. They had split
- 5 up; is that correct?
- 6 A. On occasion, there were times.
- 7 Q. Right. And there was even a period when he was
- 8 | incarcerated, a brief period during this offense conduct when
- 9 he was in jail; is that right?
- 10 A. Right, on December 14th of 2016. He was arrested for a
- 11 driving under suspension violation.
- 12 Q. Based on the intel that you have received, during those
- periods when Godinez and Jaimes were on the outs, and while he
- was in jail, did operations continue, business as usual, even
- 15 | in his absence?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Okay. Now, one of the brothers, let's talk a little bit
- 18 about one of the brothers, Otoniel. Am I saying that right?
- 19 Is that the right name? Otoniel?
- 20 A. I believe Otoniel.
- 21 Q. Otoniel?
- 22 MS. ALLRED: I should probably ask you, Judge, the
- correct pronunciation of that.
- 24 BY MS. ALLRED:
- 25 Q. But Otoniel --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. -- he was arrested in Texas; is that correct?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. And he was arrested selling two kilograms of
- 5 methamphetamine; is that right?
- 6 A. From my understanding, it was two kilograms. I know you
- 7 had brought up a higher value. I'm not aware of any other
- 8 information.
- 9 Q. Okay. But in any event, he was arrested and charged
- 10 | federally in this case; is that right?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. And he received 135 months as his sentence; is that right?
- 13 A. I have not seen -- I've just -- I was told by you that
- 14 that was the time he received, yes.
- 15 **MS. ALLRED:** May I approach?
- 16 **THE COURT:** You may.
- 17 A. And this is a possession charge, not a conspiracy charge,
- 18 so it's a different offense that he's been charged with, but,
- 19 yes, he got 133 months.
- 20 BY MS. ALLRED:
- 21 Q. Okay. And that's a valid point. He was ultimately
- 22 charged and pled guilty to possession with intent to
- 23 distribute, right, instead of the conspiracy?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. But based on your investigation of the case, would you say

- that Otoniel Duarte Godinez was higher up in the organization than Mr. Jaimes?
  - A. Certainly higher up than Mr. Jaimes, yes.

4 MS. ALLRED: May I approach to retrieve that?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. ALLRED: If I could have just a moment, Your

7 Honor.

3

5

6

8

9

THE COURT: Sure.

# BY MS. ALLRED:

- 10 Q. Now, you referenced some brothers that were -- I'm sorry,
  11 some relatives that were possibly cooking up or rocking up the
- methamphetamine once it came to --
- 13 **A.** Yes.
- 14 Q. All right. Where would you put them in the hierarchy,
- 15 starting with the Mexican source and then going down to the --
- Ms. Godinez's brothers and Ms. Godinez? Where did they fall?
- 17 A. That would be difficult to make a really -- to
- differentiate between their roles and, say, that of Jacob, Tony
- 19 and Maria.
- 20 **Q.** Okay.
- 21  $\blacksquare$  A. It would be difficult to make an assessment.
- 22 Q. Okay. But based on your testimony, you do not consider
- 23 Mr. Jaimes' role in the offense to be on par with those
- 24 | brothers and Maria; is that fair?
- 25 A. From what I know about it, there's nothing that I could

- 39 1 say he was necessarily on the same level as those other 2 players. But like I said earlier, according to Tiffany's own 3 admission, he accompanied Maria on 80 percent of the times, so 4 it's difficult to really separate their two roles when we are 5 talking about the facilitation of drug shipments. 6 Q. Sure. Well, Ms. Snodgrass, who we've all had an 7 opportunity to interview, she did not have a problem 8 differentiating between their roles, did she? Who did she work 9 for, based on her own statements? 10 What she stated is she worked for Teré, yes. 11 Ο. And she described Mr. Jaimes as -- what were your words? 12. Α. She described him as a nobody. 13 MS. ALLRED: No further questions. 14 **THE COURT:** Mr. Pisarich, do you wish to ask this
  - THE COURT: Mr. Pisarich, do you wish to ask this witness any questions?
    - MR. PISARICH: Could I ask a couple of questions,
      Your Honor?
- 18 THE COURT: Sure.

#### CROSS-EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. PISARICH:

- Q. Before my client, Ms. Godinez, got involved in this drug trafficking organization, it was more or less, at least in the
- U.S., being run by her brothers; is that correct?
- 24 A. Correct.

15

16

17

19

20

2.1

22

25 Q. All right. And at some point in time, and I want to go

- 1 quickly here, there came a time when Ms. Snodgrass became
- 2 disenchanted with them as far as how they were handling her,
- 3 correct?
- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. And then Ms. Godinez basically came in between the two of
- 6 them; is that correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. All right. Do you have any information that Ms. Godinez
- 9 was involved with this drug trafficking organization prior to
- 10 that time?
- 11 A. No, I don't.
- 12 Q. Okay. And would you at least -- so whatever time Ms.
- 13 Snodgrass said she began working back with the organization
- 14 after she had a falling out with the brothers, that would have
- 15 been the beginning point in time as far as Ms. Godinez working
- 16 for the organization; is that not correct?
- 17 A. That is correct.
- 18 Q. All right. At the time even after she became working with
- 19 the organization, would you put her at least under a rung, as
- 20 | far as the chain of command, as far as under her brothers?
- 21 A. I think they had separate roles. She was -- she presented
- 22 as the accountant for this drug trafficking organization.
- 23 | Q. Right.
- 24 A. I have drug ledgers that we recovered from her phone that
- 25 an expert at the Cryptanalysis and Records Racketeering Unit at

- 1 the FBI lab determined were ledgers for methamphetamine. I
- 2 have 137 pages of text messages between Ms. Duarte and her
- Mexican source of supply, so it's difficult for me to determine
- 4 that her role was lesser than theirs because they had different
- 5 roles in this organization.
- 6 Q. I'm not trying to win her a minor participant role here.
- 7 I'm just trying to put it in terms of hierarchy. In other
- 8 words, before she got involved, the brothers were there, and
- 9 then Ms. Snodgrass. And then she got involved, and the
- 10 | brothers were still there, and Ms. Snodgrass started back.
- 11 That's what I'm getting at. Wouldn't she be somewhere in
- 12 between? Not saying she is a minor participant. I'm not
- 13 trying to argue that.
- 14 A. Um-hm. So the information that I have, yes, they were
- 15 involved in the conspiracy a lot longer than she was, in my
- 16 opinion.
- 17 Q. Okay. And by the way, you mentioned about the drug or the
- wire transfers of money down to Mexico, right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. It was somewhere in the nature of about 150 of them, were
- 21 there not?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And none of them -- none of any individual one was over a
- 24 thousand dollars, was it?
- 25 A. Correct.

1 MR. PISARICH: I don't have any questions. 2 THE COURT: Do you have any questions for the 3 witness, Ms. Cole? 4 MS. COLE: No, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Agent Dufault, I have some questions. 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 7 Now, I was unaware that there was an THE COURT: 8 investigation, and I don't know whether it is completed or not, 9 in the Western District of Texas. And what I'm trying to 10 determine here is whether there's any evidence that I can hang 11 my hat on that would tend to show that this defendant is 12. substantially less culpable than others. And what I have right 13 now is Ms. Snodgrass' participation. 14 Were you able to identify or were you able to determine 15 whether or not Ms. Godinez and Mr. Jaimes had other couriers 16 that worked for them other than Ms. Snodgrass? 17 **THE WITNESS:** So with the examination of the text 18 messages that were recovered from her phone, they make numerous 19 references to a truck driver. And from proffers and other 20 things, we determined that that was another courier that was 2.1 involved in this drug trafficking organization. So I do have 22 information to suggest that they were not exclusively dealing 23 with Ms. Snodgrass, as far as transporting money and drugs. 24 THE COURT: So you can identify at least one

25

additional courier?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: But you can't tell me one way or the 3 other whether there were one or ten or twenty? 4 THE WITNESS: Correct. 5 THE COURT: And you cannot tell me what Mr. Jaimes' 6 participation would have been insofar as those other couriers 7 were concerned, one way or the other? 8 THE WITNESS: Correct, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: It would be -- on my part, I would have to speculate that it's either more involved or less involved or 10 11 the same amount involved as it was with Ms. Snodgrass? That's 12 all I've got? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may step 15 down. Who is your next witness? 16 MS. ALLRED: I don't intend to call any additional 17 witnesses. 18 **THE COURT:** Does the government intend to call any 19 witnesses? 20 MS. COLE: No, Your Honor. 21 **THE COURT:** And Mr. Pisarich, do you intend to call 22 any witnesses? 23 MR. PISARICH: No, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. Let me take these objections, 25 then, one at a time as they relate to both of the defendants.

There's an objection as to the inclusion of an enhancement for the possession of a firearm. The firearm was in the possession of Ms. Snodgrass at the time that she was arrested. And I think even the stipulation of Ms. Snodgrass' testimony would tend to show that she was, in fact, in possession of that firearm, and that both defendants, Ms. Godinez and Mr. Jaimes, were aware that she possessed a firearm. It was possessed during a drug trafficking offense, and not only was it reasonably foreseeable by both of these defendants that one of their co-conspirators would possess it, but they actually knew that she possessed a firearm during and in relation to the drug activities. Therefore, that objection is overruled as to both defendants.

2.1

With regard to the defendant Mr. Jaimes' objections to the calculation regarding his entitlement to a minor participant, that objection is overruled. The burden is on the defendant to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he is substantially less culpable than any of the other participants within this — what by all appearances is a mass — massive conspiracy. I am not impressed by the government's concession that Mr. Jaimes is less culpable, substantially less so than anyone else, and I am not impressed by the absence of evidence for me to speculate that his participation was limited only to his involvement with Ms. Snodgrass. In fact, my experience tells me that I can certainly infer that Mr. Jaimes'

participation, which even by Ms. Snodgrass has been characterized as a facilitation by translation and exchange of money, but that same facilitation and that same participation would have been extended to the other couriers and to the other hierarchy contained in the — within the organization.

2.1

It is my conclusion and it is my finding that the defendant has failed to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that he is substantially less culpable than any of the other participants. That objection is overruled.

Insofar as the calculation of the guidelines are concerned, I will take these one at a time, and then we will move on to the statutory sentencing factors. Let me get my work station put together here a little bit better.

The Court has ruled on the objections insofar as the case of United States versus Alfonso Fonty Jaimes. I do adopt the presentence investigation report without change, having ruled on the objections made by the defendant. I do note for purposes of the record that the account of conviction does carry a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment. I also find that by applying the facts contained in the presentence investigation report and the facts adduced here at the hearing that the total offense level is a level 39, with a criminal history category of IV. This yields, under the guidelines, a sentencing imprisonment range of 360 months to life imprisonment, supervised release range of five years, a fine

range of 50,000 to \$10 million, and the Court is aware of no additional materials which would justify a departure under the provisions of the advisory guidelines.

2.1

Insofar as the case of United States of America versus Maria Teresa Duarte Godinez, the Court does adopt the presentence investigation report without change. Having ruled on the objections made, the Court finds that the case does involve a mandatory minimum sentence under the provisions of the statute. I also find that by applying the facts as contained in the presentence investigation report, as well as the facts and evidence adduced here at the hearing, that the total offense level in this case is a level 39, criminal history category of I. This yields a sentencing imprisonment range of 362 to -- 262, I'm sorry, 262 to 327 months imprisonment, supervised release range of five years, a fine range of 50,000 to \$10 million, and the Court is aware of no additional materials which would justify a departure under the provisions of the advisory guidelines.

Insofar as the defendant, Mr. Jaimes, is concerned, Ms. Allred, do you intend to offer any additional materials which would touch upon the statutory sentencing factors that the Court will consider?

MS. ALLRED: Your Honor, we submitted a sentencing memorandum on Mr. Jaimes' behalf I believe Monday. We would ask the Court to consider that. And then we would ask the

1 Court to consider -- I don't know whether it needs to be by way 2 of an exhibit, but there is certainly no harm in admitting it, 3 the judgment in the case against Otoniel Duarte Godinez, 4 because I think it speaks to the sentencing factor concerning 5 the need to avoid unwarranted disparity in sentencing, and so 6 we would submit that as an exhibit. 7 **THE COURT:** All right. Any objection? No, Your Honor. 8 MS. COLE: 9 THE COURT: It will be marked and admitted. 10 MS. ALLRED: May I approach? 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12. (EXHIBIT D-2 MARKED) 13 MS. ALLRED: And other than argument, I don't intend 14 to submit any more evidence. 15 THE COURT: All right. I've got --16 MS. ALLRED: Oh, the letters of support, Your Honor, 17 that were submitted additionally. I forgot about that. 18 would ask the Court to consider those. 19 THE COURT: I have a series of letters, quite 20 frankly, on behalf of both defendants, and I would ask that the 2.1 clerk make them a part of the record in support of both of the 22 defendants. I want to be sure I get all of them in the record. 23 I don't want to leave any of them out. They are quite

Other than argument, Ms. Allred, anything else on behalf

voluminous, frankly. I think I've got them all.

24

25

1 of Mr. Jaimes? 2 MS. ALLRED: No, sir. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Pisarich, I will ask you, sir, do you 4 intend to offer any additional materials which touch upon the 5 statutory sentencing factors, other than the letters --6 MR. PISARICH: No, Your Honor, other than the 7 Just one thing, Your Honor, we do want to have into letters. 8 the record. While she was incarcerated, she did complete two 9 programs, and I would like the Court to be aware of that, if 10 the Court please. May I approach and have these admitted? 11 THE COURT: Certainly. Do you want me to keep those 12. copies? Are those copies for the record? 13 MR. PISARICH: These are the copies for the record. 14 **THE COURT:** Any objection? No, Your Honor. 15 MS. COLE: 16 THE COURT: They will be marked and admitted. 17 MR. PISARICH: There is a Certificate of Completion 18 here, if the Court please, to the story of Jesus' life that she 19 completed in October of 2018. There is also another 20 Certificate of Achievement from the Good News Jail and Prison 2.1 Ministry that she completed on August 17th of 2018. We will 22 make that an exhibit as well, if you please. 23 **THE COURT:** It will be a collective exhibit as 24 Defense Exhibit Number 2.

THE CLERK: It will be D2-1.

25

# (EXHIBIT D2-1 MARKED)

MR. PISARICH: Your Honor, before I sit down, we do have a motion for variance, a motion for downward departure, whenever that would come about. I just want to make the Court aware of it.

THE COURT: Well, insofar as evidence is concerned, insofar as materials are concerned that the Court would consider, is there any additional evidence?

MR. PISARICH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I will hear argument and Rule 32 argument on behalf of both defendants here shortly.

Ms. Cole, on behalf of the government, are there any additional materials that the government intends to offer that touch on the statutory sentencing factors.

MS. COLE: No, sir, Your Honor. Just pursuant to the plea agreement, the government will recommend that the Court sentence both of these defendants within the lower 25 percent of the guidelines range.

MS. ALLRED: Your Honor, out of an abundance of caution, Mr. Jaimes — it was mentioned in our sentencing memo, so it may be a little bit redundant, but we also have certificates of his Bible study. If I could, I would rather proffer into the record that he participated in weekly Bible study for most of the entire time that he was in Harrison County, beginning in February of 2010 up through July of this

year. And if the government will stipulate to that, then I 1 2 won't feel the need to put the records themselves into 3 evidence. 4 THE COURT: That is a fair request. Do you stipulate 5 that, Ms. Cole? 6 MS. COLE: Yes, Your Honor. What were --7 I will consider that as part of the THE COURT: 8 record, the completion of those two programs. 9 MS. ALLRED: Yes, sir. In fairness to the 10 government, though, I just want to make sure that she has seen 11 them and is okay with them. 12 THE COURT: Go ahead. 13 MS. ALLRED: Thank you, sir. And I did misstate the It is 2018. 14 date. 15 THE COURT: All right. Pursuant to Rule 32, Ms. 16 Allred, is there anything else that you wish to argue on behalf 17 of sentencing insofar as Mr. Jaimes is concerned? 18 There is, Your Honor. We too have filed MS. ALLRED: 19 a sentencing memorandum asking for a variance in this case, and 20 we think it is appropriate for another factor -- for a number 2.1 of factors. 22 I recognize and respect the Court's ruling concerning 23 minor role, and I think that what the parties were attempting 24 to achieve in this case was a resolution that somehow took into 25 consideration the relative roles of the people involved in this

organization, starting from the top down to the people who were actually doing the negotiations and the logistics and rocking it up, to the couriers and to Mr. Jaimes, taking not only into consideration what it is that they did but how long they did it as well.

In Mr. Jaimes' case, he was incarcerated until I believe — I have the date of April of 2015, but I'm not sure that's a correct date. We can fairly say, however, that up until not long before Ms. Snodgrass was arrested, he was either on the run in Mexico, or when he came and turned himself in, serving a time in Texas Department of Corrections. So his conduct in this case, I would be surprised if it exceeded the scope of two years. Okay? I think it is much less than that.

And we can't necessarily say that he was participating with — as Ms. Godinez's boyfriend prior to the time that they got married because he was incarcerated, and they got married I think shortly after his release, in September. He's writing me a note. He's reminding me that even after he was locked up, he was in a halfway house, which even further narrows the time he would have participated in this.

Now, Mr. Jaimes is guilty of a crime and he pled guilty. He participated in what was a widespread drug trafficking organization, but he was nowhere near the top. He wasn't directly at the bottom, but he was lower than many of these other participants in terms of decision-making authority,

proprietary interest in the drugs. In terms of being essential to the things that went on, he was not essential. He was expendable. And that is proven by the fact that the drug trafficking organization and their activities continued even when he wasn't in the picture, when he and his wife were split up or when he was arrested. It is without argument that at the time Ms. Snodgrass took her last run, Mr. Jaimes was in jail, and things continued on perfectly well without him.

He deserves to be punished. He recognizes that. I recognize that. But when you take a step back and you look at the length that he was involved and the fact that but for his relationship with his wife, I'm not sure that he would be in this particular entanglement right here. I think that that deserves some thought in terms of the sentencing. And perhaps most troubling to me is the fact that someone who is pretty high up on the food chain, one of the brothers, one of the brothers that Ms. Snodgrass was working for before Ms. Godinez got on the scene, before Mr. Jaimes got out of jail, he did a sentence of 135 months. I believe it was a downward departure from a guideline range of approximately 210. He did not cooperate, and he didn't even sign a plea agreement.

So what I'm asking for --

12.

2.1

**THE COURT:** Was that a variance then?

MS. ALLRED: It was a variance.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. ALLRED: And what I'm asking for is parity, something that takes into consideration while he may not technically meet the definition of a minor role, that catches the flavor of what it was. He was definitely involved. I think Ms. Snodgrass' words for what it was: Did he make decisions? No. Did he help get things done? Yes. But one of the people who was making decisions got 135 months. And that troubles me greatly, okay, because geography shouldn't play a part.

THE COURT: Did you tell me or do you know — it's likely that you do not know. At the time that this individual would have been sentenced, if it were a variance, then there would have been a reason for the variance. Do you have any idea what the reason for the variance was? The Court would have articulated or should have articulated a reason for that variance.

MS. ALLRED: I don't want to misspeak. I can tell you what I know and who it came from, and you can consider it for what it's worth. I did not learn until last night that Otoniel Duarte Godinez had actually already been sentenced in Texas. He was sentenced, I believe, in November. So this morning prior to Court, I reached out to the Public Defender who represented Mr. Duarte Godinez, and he said that he filed a big sentencing memorandum based on the idea that the guidelines are just too high for a nonviolent drug offender.

And so I think it possibly was — it's just you look at it, and it just doesn't sit right to think that this is the sentence that he is facing. But my concern is parity, and I recognize that that cuts both ways because we have a courier who received a very long sentence, but I anticipate that she will receive a reduction in that sentence based on her cooperation in this case.

But — so when you are comparing apples to apples, even if you took Duarte Godinez's guideline range and brought it all the way back to category I, his guideline sentence, Mr. Alfonso Jaimes' guideline sentence is still twice what Mr. Duarte Godinez received in Texas, and that's a big problem for me. And I submit that a variance is appropriate in this case to take into consideration the relative roles that each one of these played.

And finally, I really do want to be clear that I'm not downplaying what Mr. Jaimes did. And all he has asked for all along is for the presentence report and his plea to reflect those things that he actually engaged in. And if he's going to be held accountable for the global conspiracy, all of the drugs that Ms. Snodgrass did and all of Ms. Snodgrass' conduct, then it should also take into consideration what his relative role was.

THE COURT: All right. As always, Ms. Allred, you are very articulate and candid in your arguments, and I do

appreciate them.

Mr. Pisarich, is there anything else under Rule 32, any other additional comment that you wish to make before I proceed to allocution?

MR. PISARICH: Relative to the motion to variance and downward departure, Your Honor. As Your Honor well knows, but just to reiterate all of this, my client is not a U.S. citizen. She is a Mexican national. And in all likelihood, whatever the sentence pronounces, at the end of that sentence, she is going to be deported back to Mexico.

The situation as far as her category history, she's a I. If you look at the presentence investigation report, she's had one other arrest, and that was back in 2013, where she attempted to get in the United States by declaring — for asylum, and she was arrested at that point, and that's the process I guess they go through there. There was no conviction to it. In any event, she is a category history I, no other arrest other than the other arrest I'm talking about that was in the presentence investigation report.

Look at the cost of incarceration relative to this matter here. According to the presentence investigation report, \$36,300 a month for somebody imprisoned or incarceration.

Look at how my client basically got involved with the agent, even testified to. She got involved in this situation as a result of a dispute between people that were involved in

the conspiracy, that being her two brothers and Ms. Snodgrass. Had it not been for that dispute, I will just call it a dispute, my client might not have ever been involved in the drug trafficking organization.

And also, Your Honor, this was not a big moneymaker operation for either my client, and I'm assuming it for Mr. Jaimes as well.

The kind of exposure they placed themselves to and under for the kind of money I guess that they made was just a penance of — these people weren't making ten or twenty thousand, thirty thousand a month or a hundred thousand or that type situation. As far as their share, they got relatively small amounts of money in that regard.

Also, Your Honor, for Ms. Godinez, we would join in the arguments of Ms. Allred relative to the sentence of the brother, Otoniel, out there in Texas, of 135 months, as far as parity.

One other thing, Your Honor, I wanted to just reiterate. And again, this comes from the report that I received, and that's one of the reasons why — although I withdrew it, and I think that I was right in withdrawing it, and I appreciate the candor the Court had relative to the minor role participant, but I hope, Your Honor, even relative to that, as far as a variance, would take note of paragraph 56 in the report, where it states, "The case agent stated that while her role was more

than that of a courier, (such as Snodgrass), she," referring to Ms. Godinez, "was not in charge of operations. Godinez did not make assignments, did not recruit accomplices, did not receive a larger share of the profits or have decision-making authority. The case agent advised that Godinez would receive directions from the leader of the DTO."

2.1

I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the Court, not trying to argue anything relative to that as far as role in the offense. But when you take all of those things into consideration — and I think one of the things is the fact that this is really, for all intents and purposes, her first arrest. And for her to be looking at a sentence within the range of 262 to 327 appears to be, I would say, a little harsh, but it appears to be way too harsh, and I would ask the Court to consider all of these matters and to consider a reasonable departure downward, insofar a variance, to give her something that I consider to be reasonable, and knowing quite well, knowing quite well that whatever sentence Your Honor is going to give her, at the end of it, she is going back to Mexico.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pisarich. All right. Mr. Jaimes, you have the right, sir, on your own behalf to say anything that you wish to say before the Court imposes a sentence for as long as you wish to say it. Is there anything that you would like to say?

**DEFENDANT JAIMES:** Yes, sir. I got something

written, but I got something in my heart I got to speak at.

**THE COURT:** Go ahead.

wrong. I know that. After years of being incarcerated, I see things aren't going to work out the way I was hoping. To clear up the air, when I talked to the agent and when I talk to my lawyer and I told them everything I done, I been honest ever since. Just like this lady, Ms. Snodgrass is telling you what I done, I done it. And as I told the agent, the only time I touched any kind of monies was when I was went from northern Texas to McCavern, didn't know where the money was coming from. I might have had an idea, but I never touched no dope or nothing. My involvement was the money part, and I done that a couple of times.

I'm guilty, I'm guilty of it, but when I'm hearing 30 years and stuff like that, that's my whole life. I know I'm guilty, and I know come from a past, I'm a drug addict, and I had a bad past, and I'm not blaming anybody for that. I'm asking you to have consideration. That's a long time. And I've been cooperating with the agent over there, and I've been asking my attorney for the last six months to come on my phone because I got the information to help them out, because I really want to help out to the point where I want everything cleared up. That's all I got to say. I'm guilty, but just like I said, God put Your Honor — he puts all of y'all here in

y'all position because y'all are my authority, and I respect it, but I ask for some kind of consideration because this is hard to swallow. I'm a man and I'm owning up for what I done, and I want to accept that. But like I said, I got a part in it, and God willing, I could have — I'm really not that person they paint I was. And I'm grateful to have a good lawyer fighting for me.

The paper right here says, Your Honor, as God is my witness, I come before you humbled and ashamed of my actions. I'm deeply sorry for hurting all the families directly or indirectly with my actions and deeds. I just hope I can be forgiven by those in the community because I know my ways are not what they should have been. Now I'm going to look up and use all the help and resources in my reach to better myself as a son, a brother, a husband and a father. And above all, to be a rightful part of my community. I also want to express my respect and admiration to those who work and make an honest living. I know if they can do it, so can I, with the help of my God and the support of my community.

I sincerely apologize to the community and Your Honor. This is not something that you might not hear every day, but it is just being honest. I want today, tomorrow to be able to lay down with the conscience that, you know, what I done, I'm going to be punished for it. I'm not saying I don't. At the same time, I want to live my life over, Your Honor. And Your Honor,

I apologize.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Godinez, you also have the right to speak on your own behalf, that is to say anything that you wish to say in mitigation of the sentence. Is there anything that you wish to say?

MR. PISARICH: Your Honor, she wants it translated. She is going to speak in Spanish, and it's going to be translated to Your Honor.

THE COURT: And tell her to speak up because I speak Spanish, and I would like to hear it both ways.

DEFENDANT GODINEZ: First of all, I would like to say that I'm very ashamed to be in front of you. And I want to ask for forgiveness, because I know I did wrong. And this year and three months I have reflected, and I have participated in every spiritual activity, and I have learned a lot. I have many regrets to have been a part of something that has been affecting society so badly, but also to my family and to me.

I feel like not being part of my brother's funeral is very much part of my punishment. Mr. Judge, I ask you to have compassion with my sentencing. I have learned a lot, and I ask for proper opportunity. This is my first and only offense, and I promise you there will never be another one.

I want to do everything possible to finish my schooling and to be a good citizen. I want to take care of my family, and one day give me an opportunity to have kids. I will be

very grateful. With all my respects for letting me talk to you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you. The importation and the distribution of large quantities of drugs into the United States is a high risk occupation. It's a high risk while it's engaged in, and it's a high risk when defendants find themselves being caught and brought before the bar of justice. I'm going to take a short recess to consider what should be done in this case. I will be in short recess until I return.

# (RECESS TAKEN AT 2:19 P.M. UNTIL 2:36 P.M.)

THE COURT: I'm going to take these one at a time. I'm going to begin with United States versus Maria Teresa Duarte Godinez. The Court has considered the advisory guideline computations, as well as the other statutory sentencing factors that can be found under Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code, and it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 262 months as to the single count in the indictment. Because the minimum and the maximum of the guideline range does exceed 24 months, the Court states that it is imposing this sentence at the lower end, at the lowest end of the advisory sentencing guidelines in compliance with and comporting with the recommendation of the government for a sentence at the lower 25 percentile of the advisory quidelines, and in order to avoid disparate sentencing with similarly situated individuals.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have also, in that regard, considered all of the other aggravating and mitigating circumstances attended in the case. It is further ordered that the defendant will pay a fine in the amount of \$7,500 which is due immediately. Payment of the fine shall begin while the defendant is in custody. Upon release, any unpaid balance shall be paid at a rate of at least \$150 per month, beginning 30 days after release from custody. This fine is, of course, a downward departure from the applicable advisory guideline range and is based on the defendant's ability to pay. The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay interest on this fine. Therefore, interest is waived. In the event that the fine is not paid in full prior to termination of supervised release, the defendant is ordered to enter into a written agreement with the financial litigation unit of the United States Attorney's office for payment of the remaining balance.

Additionally, the value of any future discovered assets may be applied to offset the balance of the criminal monetary penalties. The defendant may be included in the Treasury Offset Program allowing qualified federal benefits to be applied to offset the balance of the criminal monetary penalties.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years. Within

72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which she is released, if not deported.

2.1

While on supervised release, the defendant shall comply with the mandatory and the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court and shall not possess a firearm.

In addition, the following special condition is imposed:

Number one, at the completion of the defendant's term of imprisonment, the defendant shall be surrendered to the custody of the Immigration & Customs Enforcement for removal proceedings consistent with the Immigration and Nationality Act. If removed, the defendant shall not reenter the United States without the written permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security. The term of supervised release shall be non-reporting while the defendant resides outside of the United States. If the defendant reenters the United States within the term of supervised release, she is to report to the nearest United States Probation Office within 72 hours of her arrival.

The Court notes for purposes of the record that if it has erred in the treatment of any of the guideline applications in this case, that the Court would have imposed an identical sentence pursuant to any available variance, which would have been based upon the offense conduct in the case, the characteristics of the defendant, and all other factors, aggravating or mitigating, which can be found under Section

3553 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

2.1

I will recommend that the defendant be housed in a facility closest to her home for purposes of visitation and that she be allowed to participate in the Bureau of Prisons 500-hour drug treatment program. Anything else on behalf of the government?

MS. COLE: No, Your Honor.

PROBATION OFFICER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I did not write down whether a special assessment was imposed in this case. I don't remember if the Court did it or not.

THE COURT: I may not have included that, but she is ordered to pay the mandatory special assessment in the amount of \$100. That is due immediately. How did I miss that?

Anything else on behalf of the government, did you say, Ms.

Cole?

MS. COLE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else on behalf of the defendant, Mr. Pisarich?

MR. PISARICH: Nothing, Your Honor, other than — I think I noted to the probation officer the new address or address in California that she wanted to have referenced as her home address. Is that noted?

THE COURT: She will be interviewed by the Bureau of Prisons before she is designated to an institution. She will need to be sure to tell them what her home address is.

**PROBATION OFFICER:** I would just say, there is an address in the presentence report of a California address, so I believe that has been taken care of.

2.1

MR. PISARICH: Very well. That's all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pisarich.

I will take up next, United States of America versus Alfonso Fonty Jaimes.

The Court has considered the advisory sentencing guidelines and the other sentencing factors that can be found under Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code, and it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 262 months. The Court notes for purposes of the record that this constitutes a substantial variance. It is a variance downward from the applicable advisory Federal Sentencing Guidelines. The Court notes that the purpose of this variance is to avoid disparate treatment of this defendant, that is, a sentence that is more severe than similarly situated defendants, and it is well within or below, actually, the recommendation of the government of a sentence in the lower 25 percentile.

I will make this comment, Mr. Jaimes. Mr. Jaimes and Ms. Godinez were partners in crime. They were partners in a conspiracy, and they were partners in the fruits of that crime, and I see no reason why they should not be sentenced equally.

It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay a fine in the amount of \$25,000. That is due immediately. This fine, of course, represents another downward departure and is based upon the defendant's ability to pay. Payment of the fine shall begin while the defendant is incarcerated. Upon release, any unpaid balance shall be paid at a rate of at least \$150 per month, with the first payment due 30 days after release from imprisonment. The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay interest on this fine. Therefore, the interest is waived. In the event the fine is not paid in full prior to termination of supervised release, the defendant is ordered to enter into a written agreement with the financial litigation unit of the United States Attorney's office for payment of the remaining balance.

2.1

Additionally, the value of any future discovered assets may be applied to offset the balance of the criminal monetary penalties. The defendant may be included in the Treasury Offset Program allowing qualified federal benefits to be applied to offset the balance of the criminal monetary penalties.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years as to Count 1 of the indictment. Within 72 hours of release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which he is

released. While on supervised release, the defendant shall comply with the mandatory and the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court and shall not possess a firearm.

2.1

In addition, the following special conditions are imposed:

Number one, the defendant shall not — or shall provide the probation office with access to any requested financial information.

Number two, the defendant shall not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation office and unless the defendant is in compliance with the installment payment schedule.

Number three, the defendant shall participate in a program of testing and/or treatment for drug or alcohol abuse as directed by the probation office. If enrolled in a drug or alcohol treatment program, the defendant shall abstain from consuming alcoholic beverages during treatment and shall continue to abstain for the remaining period of supervision. The defendant shall contribute to the cost of treatment in accordance with the probation office co-payment policy.

Number four, the defendant shall not possess, ingest or otherwise use a synthetic cannabinoid or a synthetic narcotic unless it is prescribed by a licensed medical practitioner and for a legitimate medical purpose.

Number five, in the event the defendant resides in or visits a jurisdiction where marijuana or marijuana products

have been approved, legalized or decriminalized, the defendant shall not possess, ingest or otherwise use marijuana or marijuana products unless prescribed by a licensed medical practitioner and for a legitimate medical purpose.

12.

2.1

And number six, the defendant shall submit his person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, electronic communication devices or office to a search conducted by a United States Probation Officer. Failure to submit to search may be grounds for revocation of supervised release. The defendant shall warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. An officer may conduct a search only when reasonable suspicion exists that the defendant has violated a condition of supervision and that the areas to be searched contain evidence of this violation. Any search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

If the Court has erred in the findings affecting any of the applications of the advisory Federal Sentencing Guidelines in this case, I note for the record that the Court would have imposed an identical sentence pursuant to any available variance or a non-guideline sentence which would be based upon the defendant's conduct in the case, the statutory sentencing factors found under Section 3553 of Title 18, and any and all aggravating and mitigating circumstances attendant in the case.

Pursuant to Section 862 of Title 21 of the United States

1 Code, the defendant is ineligible and is deemed ineligible for 2 any and all federal benefits for a term of one year. It is 3 further ordered that he shall pay the mandatory special 4 assessment in the amount of \$100. 5 I will recommend that he be housed in a facility closest 6 to home for purposes of visitation and that he be allowed to 7 participate in any drug treatment program for which he is 8 deemed eligible by the Bureau of Prisons. Anything else on 9 behalf of the government? 10 MS. COLE: No, Your Honor. 11 **THE COURT:** Anything else on behalf of the defendant? 12 MS. ALLRED: No, sir. 13 **THE COURT:** Very well. The defendant is remanded to 14 the custody of the United States Marshals pending designation 15 to the appropriate institution. 16 Ms. Caldwell, I have not noted your good work, but thank 17 you so much for helping the Court as an interpreter. 18 nothing else, thank you all. 19 (HEARING CONCLUDED) 20 21 22 23 24

25

1

2

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

# CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, Teri B. Norton, RMR, FCRR, RDR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me using the stenotype reporting method in conjunction with computer-aided transcription, and that same is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

S/ Teri B. Norton

TERI B. NORTON, RMR, FCRR, RDR

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER